



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

cal

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,223	02/26/2002	Hidekazu Umeda	112075	2626
25944	7590	12/15/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			JUNG, MIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/082,223	Applicant(s) UMEDA, HIDEKAZU	
	Examiner Min Jung	Art Unit 2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2002.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, lines 6-8, and in similar places in claims 5 and 14, it is not clear whether or not the phrase enclosed by parentheses constitutes a claim limitation; If it is, then it should be incorporated into the claim recitation in a positive manner, and if it is not, then it should be deleted from the claim recitation.

In claim 1, line 5, "the link state" lacks antecedent basis. At lines 5-8, it is not clear what is 'capable of direct communication', and with what? Further, it is not clear if the routing table is constructed based on the exchanged link state?

In claim 1, lines 12-13, it seems that the limitation contradicts the recitation that follows at lines 14-17, and at lines 18-20, because it seems that the recitation implies that the destination terminal broadcasts the packet, and also the destination terminal returns the packet in a unicast manner. Further, at lines 14-17, it is not clear what is meant by the radio terminals on the route transfers said packet to all radio terminals based on said routing table; does this also mean broadcasting?

In claim 5, lines 1-2, it is not clear what constitutes a wireless network?

In claim 5, lines 3-6, "the link state" lacks antecedent basis. Further, it is not clear what is 'capable of direct communication', and with what? Further, it is not clear if the routing table is constructed based on the exchanged link state?

In claim 5, lines 7-10, "said packet", "the prescribed terminal", and "the received packet" lack antecedent basis. Further, the identity of "itself" is unclear. Further, "the intermediate routing information" and "the routing stack" lack antecedent basis.

In claim 5, lines 11-15, it is not clear what exactly is meant by "is broadcast"; does it mean that the packet is a broadcast packet? Further, it is not clear if transferring the packet to all radio terminals based on said routing table means a broadcast or a multicast based on the routing information in the routing table?

In claim 5, lines 16-21, it is not clear whether or not "said packet" is the same packet as the packet recited at lines 7, 8, 10, 12, and 14.

In claim 14, it is not clear whether or not the program recorded in the medium causes the execution at each respective radio terminal?

In claim 14, line 5, "the link state" lacks antecedent basis. At lines 5-8, it is not clear what is 'capable of direct communication', and with what? Further, it is not clear if the routing table is constructed based on the exchanged link state?

In claim 14, lines 9-12, "said packet", "the prescribed terminal", "the intermediate routing information", and "the routing stack" lack antecedent bases. Further, it is not clear what the identity of "itself" is.

In claim 14, lines 13-17, it is not clear what exactly is meant by "is broadcast"; does it mean that the packet is a broadcast packet? Further, it is not clear if transferring

the packet to all radio terminals based on said routing table means a broadcast or a multicast based on the routing information in the routing table?

In claim 14, lines 18-23, it is not clear whether or not "said packet" is the same packet as the packet recited at lines 9, 12, 16, and 19.

Conclusion


3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Larsson et al. patent, the Toh patent, the Lipasti et al. patent, the Navas patent, the Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al. PG Pub., the Poor patent, the Li patent, the Ogier et al. PG Pub., the Stine PG Pub., and the Johansson et al. PG Pub. Are cited for further references.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Min Jung whose telephone number is 571-272-3127. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJ
December 10, 2005


Min Jung
Primary Examiner